

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov	V
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
03370-P0055A	8697

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 10/661,243 09/12/2003 Stefan Sandberg EXAMINER 24126 12/30/2004 ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC KING, BRADLEY T 986 BEDFORD STREET ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619 3683

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
				30		
Office Action Summary		10/661,243	SANDBERG ET AL.			
	Omce Action Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	The MAIL INC DATE of this communication	Bradley T King	3683			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the cover sneet w	ıtın tne correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory ire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi. y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI y statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	n.		
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	04 October 2004.				
′=	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.					
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Ex The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 September 20</u> Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to by	<u>03</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(a	d).		
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ a)i	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Election for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have beer Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage			
Attachmen	(t/e)			~		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)			
2) Notic	the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/or No(s)/Mail Date	48) Paper No	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 3683

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the embodiment of claim 7 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites "adjacent discs". It is not clear if this limitation refers to the previously recited "at least one brake disc" or if additional discs are required.

Claim 9 recites "when they are closely positioned with one another". It is not clear what the addition of this limitation is intended to convey.

Claim 10 recites "one disc". It is not clear if this limitation refers to the previously recited "at least one brake disc" or if additional discs are required.

Art Unit: 3683

Claim 11 recites "two or more discs". It is not clear if this limitation refers to the previously recited "at least one brake disc" or if additional discs are required.

Claims 12, 15 and 16 recite "each brake disc". It is not clear if this limitation refers to the previously recited "at least one brake disc" or if additional discs are required.

Claim 13 recites "the corresponding one brake disc". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2001-32854 (also note US equiv. US 6419065).

JP 2001-32854 discloses all the limitations of the instant claims including: a connection between at least one brake disc (91) and a hub 14 of a disc brake, which brake disc is received slidable and non-rotatable on the hub, characterized in that each of the at least one brake disc includes a plurality of plates 92 attached on an inner periphery, each of the plates having a length in the axial direction of the hub exceeding the thickness of the corresponding one brake disc.

Art Unit: 3683

Regarding claim 3, see paragraph [0043] of JP 2001-32854 or column 10, line 65 of the US equivalent.

Regarding claims 5-7, JP 2001-32854 discloses plates received in every tooth gap which reads on every nth gap, every second gap, and every gap.

Regarding claim 8, see figure 5. The length of the plates extend on a length longer than the length of the tooth gap at the inner periphery of the gap.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-32854.

JP 2001-32854 discloses all the limitations of the instant claim with exception to the plates being attached to the disc through welding, soldering, gluing or the like. Instead, JP 2001-32854 discloses the plates being integral to the brake disc. Ilzig et al disclose a similar disc arrangement and further teach affixing the disc though means such as laser welding. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the disc of JP 2001-32854 from separate elements welded together as

Art Unit: 3683

taught by Ilzig et al as an obvious alternate method of manufacture, resulting in substantially equivalent structure.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9 and 13-14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 9 has been interpreted as requiring at least two discs which have plates which overlap in the axial direction.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/04/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is maintained that tooth portions 92 of JP 2001-32854 read on the recited "plates". Note that each tooth portion is made of three plate portions (figure 5) all of which have a axial length longer that the thickness of brake disc 91. Plate portion 92b reads upon the plates as broadly recited by the claims.

Regarding the drawing objection, 37 CFR 1.83 (a) requires, "The drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. However, conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding

Art Unit: 3683

of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation (e.g., a labeled rectangular box)."

37 CFR 1.83 clearly requires that every feature of the invention specified by the claims be shown in some form in the drawings. While 37 CFR 1.81(a) states "the applicant for a patent is required to furnish a drawing of his or her invention where necessary for tie understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented", this does not negate the requirements of 37 CFR 1.83.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3683

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley T King whose telephone number is (703) 308-8346. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:00-7:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor can be reached on (703) 308-0830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BTK

ROBERT A. SICONOLLI
PATENT EXAMINER